

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 30-36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS Claims 32-36 and CANCELS Claims 19-29.

Applicant greatly appreciates the allowance of Claims 30 and 31 by the Examiner.
Applicant has amended Claims 32-36 to depend upon allowed Claim 30.

On page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Ito et al. ("Magnetic Flux Loss In Rare-earth Magnets Irradiated With 200 MeV Protons"). On page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato et al. (JP 2002-299110) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). On page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 24-27, 29, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. ("Permanent Magnet Array For The Magnetic Refrigerator") in view of Kato et al. On page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Kato et al., and further in view of Stelter (U.S. 5,635,889). On page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 24-26 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stelter in view of Kato et al. On page 5 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stelter in view of Kato et al. and further in view of Ohkawa (U.S. 2,890,348). On page 6 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 24-27 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leupold (U.S. 5,347,254) and Leupold (U.S. H591), incorporated by reference, in view of Kato et al. On page 7 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leupold and Leupold (H591) in view of Kato et al., and further in view of Stelter.

As noted above, Applicant has canceled Claims 19-29 and has amended Claims 32-36 to depend upon allowed Claim 30. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these prior art rejections are moot.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record, applied alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Claim 30 of the present application. Claims 31-36 depend upon Claim 30 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 30 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Amendment After Final Rejection because this application is in condition for allowance because the Examiner allowed Claims 30 and 31 and Applicant has amended the remaining claims, Claims 32-36, to depend upon Claim 30. See MPEP § 714.13.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 17, 2009

/Peter Medley #56,125/
Attorneys for Applicant

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200
Reston, VA 20191
Telephone: (571) 313-7440
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Peter Medley
Registration No. 56,125